



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,326	11/26/2003	Lingan Satkunanathan	MS302989.1	9470
27195	7590	09/14/2005	EXAMINER	
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP 24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET CLEVELAND, OH 44114			SHERR, CRISTINA O	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/723,326	SATKUNANATHAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	Art Unit	
	Cristina Owen Sherr	3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2003.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

4)  Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_ .  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is in response to the application filed November 26, 2003.

Claims 1-36 have been examined in this case.

#### ***Specification***

2. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Christiano (US 5,671,412) in view of Beck et al (US 6,381,640).

5. Regarding claim 1 –

Christiano discloses a system for adding or transferring licenses to a computer system comprising: a license database interface component that communicates with a license database, (e.g. col 10 ln 10-25).

6. Christiano does not disclose a wizard and graphical interface. Beck, however, does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10).

7. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being widely done.

8. Regarding claim 2 –

As above, Christiano does not disclose a wizard and graphical interface. Beck, however, does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being done.

9. Regarding claim 3 –

Christiano discloses a system wherein the license code is indicative of the number of licenses to be added or transferred to a computer system (e.g. col 10 ln 20-40).

10. Regarding claim 4 –

Christiano discloses a system wherein the license database interface component receives the license code from the interface component and generates a corresponding activation code (e.g. col 12 ln 20-30).

11. Regarding claim 5 –

As above, Christiano does not disclose a wizard and graphical interface. Beck, however, does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more

user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being done.

12. Regarding claim 6 –

Christiano discloses a system wherein license component stores license data including a quantity representing the number of licenses to be added or transferred to the license store (e.g. col 10 ln 20-30).

13. Regarding claim 7 –

As above, Christiano does not disclose a wizard and graphical interface. Beck, however, does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being done. Further, Christiano contemplates the use of the Internet or other networks in license management (e.g. col 9 ln 20--30).

14. Regarding claim 8 –

As above, Christiano does not disclose a wizard and graphical interface. Beck, however, does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being done.

15. Regarding claim 9 –

Christiano discloses a system wherein the user receives the activation code over the telephone (e.g. col 4 ln 10-35).

16. Regarding claim 10 –

Christiano discloses a system for backing up and restoring licenses comprising: a backup storage interface component (e.g. col 4 ln 40-65). As above, Christiano does not disclose a wizard and graphical interface. Beck, however does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being done.

17. Regarding claim 11 –

Christiano discloses a system wherein a user specifies a particular backup data store and file path where the backup copies of one or more licenses are to be stored (e.g. col 5 ln 10-35). As above, Christiano does not disclose a wizard and graphical interface. Beck, however does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being done.

18. Regarding claims 12 – 15

Christiano discloses a system wherein the backup data is stored on a portable storage medium, which may include a floppy disk, flash memory device or optical storage medium (e.g. col 3 ln 10-35).

19. Regarding claim 16 –

Christiano discloses a system, wherein the user receives confirmation of success in backing up one or more licenses (e.g. col 4 ln 20-45). As above, Christiano does not disclose a wizard and graphical interface. Beck, however does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being done.

20. Regarding claim 17 –

Christiano discloses a system of claim 10, wherein the a user receives a file path from a user designating the location of the backup license copies and interacts with the backup storage interface component to retrieve the backup copy and save it to the license store so as to restore corrupted license data (e.g. col 5 ln 20-35). As above, Christiano does not disclose a wizard and graphical interface. Beck, however does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being widely done.

21. Regarding claim 18 –

Christiano discloses a method for adding licenses to a computer system comprising: accepting a license agreement; indicating a method of contacting a license database; providing a license code identifying a particular license component; receiving an activation code from the license database, wherein the activation code is provided to a license component to activate the license component that then installs digital licenses to the computer system (e.g. col 10 ln 10-25).

22. Christiano does not disclose a graphical interface and interactive screen. Beck, however does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10).

23. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being done.

24. Regarding claim 19 –

Christiano discloses a method wherein a license agreement is accepted. (e.g. col 10 ln 10-25).

25. As above, Christiano does not disclose a graphical interface and interactive screen. Beck, however does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10).

26. Regarding claims 20- 21 –

Christiano discloses a method wherein one method of contacting a license database is using the Internet, or the telephone (e.g. col 4 ln 10-55).

27. Regarding claim 22 –

Christiano discloses a method comprising providing an installation ID to the license database (e.g. col 5 ln 10-45).

28. Regarding claim 23 –

Christiano discloses a method wherein the number of digital licenses installed is related to license code associated with a license component (e.g. col 6 ln 10-35).

29. Regarding claim 24 –

Christiano discloses a method further comprising providing credit card information to facilitate purchasing a license component (e.g. col 3 ln 35-55).

30. Regarding claim 25 –

Christiano discloses a method wherein a purchased license component is downloaded from a web site (e.g. col 3 ln 35-55).

31. Regarding claim 26 –

Christiano discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carry out the method of claim 18 (e.g. col 3 ln 35-55).

32. Regarding claim 27 –

As above, Christiano does not disclose a wizard and graphical interface. Beck, however does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being done.

33. Regarding claim 28-31 –

Christiano discloses the he method of claim 27, wherein the location corresponds to a particular place on a portable external storage medium, such as a floppy disk, flash memory device or optical storage medium (e.g. col 3 ln 10-35).

34. Regarding claim 32 –

Christiano discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carry out the method of claim 27 (e.g. col 3 ln 30-55).

35. Regarding claim 33 –

Christiano discloses a method for restoring licenses comprising: specifying a file path identifying the location of a backup copy of one or more licenses; and receiving confirmation that licenses have been restored (e.g. col 10 ln 10-25).

36. Christiano does not disclose a wizard and graphical interface. Beck, however does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10).

37. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being widely done.

38. Regarding claims 24-25 –

Christiano discloses the method of claim 33, wherein there is a mechanism to browse storage locations to facilitate identifying the location of a backup copy, and mechanism for printing information associated with confirmation that licenses have been restored (e.g. col 3 ln 40-65).  
(e.g. col 10 ln 10-25).

39. As above, Christiano does not disclose a wizard and graphical interface. Beck, however does (e.g. col 5 ln 20 col 6 ln 10).

40. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Christiano and Beck in order to make a more user-friendly license manager. Further, it would be obvious to adapt the wizard and graphical interface to a license manager or to any of a number of applications as is indeed being widely done.

41. Regarding claim 36 –

Christiano discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer executable instructions for carry out the method of claim 33 (e.g. col 4 ln 20-35).

42. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

### ***Conclusion***

43. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cristina Owen Sherr whose telephone number is 571-272-6711. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 Monday through Friday.

44. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

45. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

\*\*\*

*John Riney*  
PRIMARY EXAMINER